

Foreign Policy Questions

Presidential Debate Briefing Papers:
Foreign Policy and National Security

Leadership	Tab 1
Military Balance	Tab 2
SALT	Tab 3
U.S.-Soviet Relations	Tab 4
Western Alliance	Tab 5
Persian Gulf	Tab 6
Hostages	Tab 7
Middle East Peace Process	Tab 8
U.S. Policy Toward China	Tab 9
Central America	Tab 10
Human Rights	Tab 11
Future Goals	Tab 12

COPY
JUN 27 1983

also Portugal
Zimbabwe

Rick Inderfurth
Eric Newsom

October 20, 1980

Leadership

Mr. President, a widespread and persistent complaint in this country and abroad about foreign policy under your Administration is that it lacks coherence, steadiness and consistency. It is said that the various strands of policy are unrelated to one another, and that you have lurches indecisively from one approach to another, pushed by events. Your critics say you have flip-flopped on the withdrawal of U. S. troops from South Korea, the neutron bomb, the Soviet brigade in Cuba, support for the Shah, among others. They say you cannot lead this country and the West in dealing with an aggressive Soviet Union, the energy crisis, and a faltering global economy.

The Republican Platform charges "For three and one half years the Carter Administration has given us a foreign policy not of consistency and credibility, but of chaos, confusion, and failure. It has produced an image of our country as a vacillating and reactive nation, unable to define its place in the world, the goals it seeks, or the means to pursue them." "No failure of the Administration has been so catastrophic as its failure of leadership," concludes the GOP platform. Governor Reagan has said that under your Administration America's economic, military and strategic strength is eroding.

Mr. President, how do you respond to the charge that you have not provided leadership, that we are no longer respected or trusted, and that you have not devised effective policies to deal with the serious problems that threaten us?

A: 1. THEME

I believe that leadership is:

- Tackling real problems, unpopular problems;
- Strengthening our defenses;
- Keeping cool in crises and staying out of wars;
- Standing up to our adversaries where we must, but cooperating if we can;
- Placing America on the side of change, on the side of human rights and justice.

2. RECORD

We have tackled the real problems. In 1976:

- There was no international energy policy. No real cooperation in conservation. No American energy program to work to free us from dependence on foreign oil. Now there is.
- There was no peace in the Middle East. Now we have the Camp David Accords and the Israel/Egypt Peace Treaty.
- We were still estranged from China. Normalization had bogged down. We broke through the logjam and have a strong growing relationship with China.
- Insurgency threatened the Panama Canal. Today it is operating smoothly and effectively.
- In Africa, America was seen as opposing racial justice. Today we have the closest possible relations with Africa because of our commitment to majority rule and racial justice.
- The world economy was threatened by protectionism but we negotiated the multilateral trade agreement and got it through Congress.
- The threat of the spread of nuclear weapons was ignored. Now we have made it high on the world agenda and built new cooperative arrangements to contain this threat.
- The developing world in which most of mankind lives was trapped in poverty and drifting towards increasing violence. We have dramatically strengthened international banks and lending institutions to help meet their crying economic needs.
- Finally, there was the prospect of an unlimited arms race. SALT I was running out. SALT II was bogged down. We have strengthened the proposed SALT II Agreement and we have signed it. Because I am determined to tackle real problems, I am determined to see SALT II ratified.

Strengthening Our Defenses. When I came into office:

- Real defense investment had declined over the previous eight years by 37%. I have increased it 10%.
- Purchases for new aircraft (fighters and attack aircraft) and for army equipment had declined by two-thirds. I have increased them by 50%.
- There was no answer to the Soviet threat to our fixed ICBMs. Now we have the mobile MX.
- There was no answer to Soviet air defenses. We were stuck with the obsolete B-1. Now we have the cruise missile.
- Our Navy had been cut in half and the shipyards were in a mess with enormous backlogs of naval vessels needing overhaul. We cleaned up the mess in the shipyards. We cut the backlog in half and we are now building more than 90 new ships at a rate of 70% greater than during the previous Republican Administration.
- There was no NATO defense program. I negotiated a commitment of our Allies to 3% real growth and we have adopted a long-term defense program to strengthen NATO.
- We had no capability to do anything quickly in the vital area of the Persian Gulf. Now we have a Rapid Deployment Force. We have facilities in four areas in the region and are strengthening our base in Diego Garcia. We pre-positioned equipment for 12,000 Marines and munitions for 500 aircraft and additional combat brigades. We have two carrier task forces on station at all times to keep open the Strait of Hormuz and defend our friends and our vital interests in the region. None of this existed before.

Staying Out of Wars. The issue is what is done with this military power:

- It is easier to get into a war as we have all learned than it is to get out of one.
- In the last three and a half years we could have involved ourselves directly in more than one-half dozen wars, revolutions or conflicts -- Iraq/Iran, Lebanon, Nicaragua, Angola, Somalia/Ethiopia and Cambodia. We did not do so.

Successful
1515
management
no more
ing to get over

- At the same time, others have called in the last several years for involvement in such places. In particular, in Angola, Lebanon as well as in ludicrous places like Ecuador. Leadership is knowing when to exercise restraint.

Standing Up To Our Adversaries. And often America must draw the line:

- It must not be afraid to say that the Persian Gulf is an area of vital interest. It must not be afraid to lead a boycott of Moscow as the site for the Olympics.
- Leadership is having the political courage during the Presidential campaign of invoking a grain embargo even if it is politically unpopular.

Human Rights and Change. Above all, leadership is placing America in the forefront of history.

- This means being on the side of change and not wishing we could return to the 1950's.
- This means supporting human rights and democracy and not coddling dictators, ignoring racial oppression in Africa and the need for human rights throughout the world.
- When I came into office America was losing its place as the beacon of hope and a force for human rights and basic decency in the world. That has changed. We must not turn back the clock.

3. REAGAN

- All these major achievements were gained by careful diplomacy and patient negotiation. None were won by threats of military force or intervention, or by nostalgic talk about American economic or military superiority.
- Governor Reagan appears not to favor the step-by-step approach of negotiation and diplomacy. His first answer to foreign policy problems is to advocate some military response:

5

He has called for sending U. S. military forces or issuing of ultimatums in crises involving Cuba, Angola, Vietnam after the U. S. military withdrawal, North Korea, Lebanon, Ecuador, Rhodesia, Pakistan, Cyprus, the Middle East and others.

- I am not going to send American forces to fight Ecuador over tuna. I will use military force only when vital American interests are threatened by military force.
- Governor Reagan would junk the SALT II Treaty, which took seven years and three Administrations to negotiate, and would launch us on an uncontrolled arms race in the hopes of frightening the Soviets into a new agreement. I think this would destroy the arms control proces and cause a nuclear arms race with incalculable results.
- Governor Reagan believes Alaska has more oil reserves than Saudi Arabia, and his energy policy would be to free the oil companies from taxes and environmental constraints and free them to find all the oil we need at home. This is Fantasy. Reality is that we must conserve energy and develop new sources, while continuing to protect our environment.

4. CONCLUDING REMARKS.

- America is strong militarily, politically and economically, and we are growing stronger. My record in all these areas in foreign and national security policy is good.
- I will continue to pursue policies such as advocacy of human rights which identify the United States with justice, democracy, and a decent life for all peoples, and which help promote peaceful change.
- I intend to continue my policy of combining measures to strengthen our defense with efforts to negotiate fair and verifiable limits and reductions in armaments..
- In contrast, Governor Reagan's preoccupation with weapons, military power and assertive behavior is likely to antagonize or frighten our allies and friends, provoke a nuclear arms race, destroy the SALT process, and involve the U. S. in trouble all over the globe.

Military Balance

Q: President Carter, your Administration has been accused of allowing the military balance with the Soviet Union to deteriorate to a position of U.S. inferiority and ushering in a period of grave danger to U.S. interests around the world. The Secretary of Defense has said that even with the post-Afghanistan defense spending increases, it would require 40 years to catch up to Soviet expenditures. The Army Chief of Staff, General Meyer, recently stated that we have "a hollow Army."

How do you view the trends -- and the implications of these trends -- in the military balance? Are we, as Governor Reagan has charged, "second to one; namely, the Soviet Union" in military strength today?

A: 1. THEME

We have turned around our defenses from a decade of decline in spending. But we are not going to embark on a wasteful crash program or provoke a dangerous arms race. Historically, arms races have always ended in war.

2. RECORD

I reversed a decade of decline in spending on our defenses from 1968 to 1976.

- Defense spending declined by 37 percent. I have increased it 10 percent. My program for the next five years calls for appropriations of over one trillion dollars for defense.
- Purchases of combat aircraft and army equipment dropped two-thirds in those eight years. I have already increased such purchases by 50 percent.

Strategic forces are our deterrent to nuclear war. But when I came into office:

- There was no answer to the Soviet threat to our fixed ICBM's. Now we have one -- the mobile M-X missile.
- There was no answer to Soviet air defenses. The B-1 bomber was already growing obsolete. We had no strategic cruise missile program, but now the first strategic cruise missile will join the strategic air force next year.

In Europe, there was no allied program to strengthen our defenses.

- I personally negotiated with allied leaders a commitment to three percent real growth, and we have developed a long-term NATO defense program.

There was a growing nuclear gap in Europe.

- We are closing it with a US-led program to deploy long-range missiles in Europe.

Our forces in Europe were not ready. They were undermanned. They were threatened by overwhelming Soviet tank superiority.

- I increased our Army by 15 percent -- 26,000 men.
- We have deployed in the last three and a half years more than 50,000 anti-tank missiles. That is equal to the entire Warsaw Pact tank threat against NATO. And we are deploying more at a rate five times faster than the Soviets are deploying tanks.

When I came into office, our Navy had been cut in half by the Republicans. The shipyards were a mess with almost \$3 billion in disputed claims.

- We cleared up the mess, and we are now building 70 percent more ships per year than the average under the Republican Administration.

Finally, we had no capability to rapidly protect our interests in the vital area of the Persian Gulf.

- Now, we have a Rapid Deployment Force. It will begin exercising next month.
- We have facilities in four areas in the region and a base at Diego Garcia that we are strengthening.
- We have pre-positioned equipment for 12,000 Marines and munitions for additional combat brigades and for more than 5,000 tacair sorties.
- We have two carrier task forces on station in the region at all times with air and naval preponderance to keep open the Straits of Hormuz where half of the nations' oil must flow.

This is a good record. It is a record of steady, determined and prudent strengthening of our defenses together with our allies. It provides us with an increasingly strong military posture consistent with strengthening our economy.

3. REAGAN

- Governor Reagan's charge that we are now second to the Soviet Union in military strength reminds me that in almost every national campaign a candidate charges that the Soviets are ahead of us. After the election, those charges are either forgotten or are found to be false. If our nation were neglecting its defenses, it would be the duty of all informed people to sound the alarm. But false declarations of weakness only intensify the dangers we face. They can cause our friends to doubt us and our enemies to discount us.
- While we want to build our security for the future, the Republicans would have us invest more today on even obsolete weapons. Governor Reagan has continued to cite the B-1 as a plane that should have been built. The fact is it would be obsolete almost as fast as we could deploy it. The Republicans wanted to revive the ABM system which President Nixon discarded. They want a new air defense system which is an anachronism in the missile age. They even want to recommission mothballed ships. This is a program of obsolescence that would waste billions of defense dollars and simply let the Soviets catch up to us in advanced technology.
- Governor Reagan will not tell us how much his arms race would cost. Conservative estimates suggest that next year alone, it could equal the size of the FY 81 deficit.
- If we embark on such a crash program, what will happen to the economy? What will happen to the dollar? Our economy and the strength of the dollar are also vital elements of our nation's security.
- Governor Reagan said he would tear up the SALT II Treaty. The Department of Defense has estimated this could cost the American people up to \$100 billion in additional defense spending with no increase in security. That is approximately equal to Governor Reagan's proposed defense increase.

- A strategy of tearing up arms limitations agreements and then having to spend \$100 billion to compensate for these agreements is not only wasteful and foolish, it is extremely dangerous. Unlike Governor Reagan, I do not believe in threatening an arms race. The Governor should look at history and answer a basic question. What arms race did not end in a war?

4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

- The question facing Americans is not whether we should respond to these developments. All agree that we must. The real question is whether we will continue with a well-conceived and measured response tailored to the actual threats we face, or whether we will run off wildly in all directions at once, spending vastly greater sums to no positive effect -- and provoke an arms race in the bargain.
- My Administration will preserve our national security. We will improve our capabilities as necessary to maintain the military balance that exists today between the United States and the Soviet Union. We will continue to make steady and sustained increases in defense spending to build the capabilities we need. We will buy only the weapon systems that best serve our needs, not every glamorous weapon system that comes along. And, we will continue to seek arms control agreements -- like the SALT II Treaty -- to limit the growth in Soviet military power, and to avoid spending resources unnecessarily in an uncontrolled arms race.
- All of America's Presidents in the post-war period have agreed with John Kennedy's maxim. John Kennedy said it well.

While maintaining our readiness for war, we must exhaust every avenue for peace. Let us always make clear our willingness to talk, if talk will help, and our readiness to fight, if fight we must. Our foremost aim is the control of force, not the pursuit of force, in a world made safe for mankind.

We have and are building further the strength to make mankind safe.

SALT

Q: President Carter, Governor Reagan calls the SALT II Treaty flawed and says he would drop it and go directly into SALT III negotiations. He says our allies do not really support the Treaty and that it was dead in the Senate even before Afghanistan caused you to shelve it. You continue to assert that the SALT II Treaty is in the interests of the United States and its allies. You say you will press for its ratification in the new Senate.

Mr. President, why do you believe the SALT II Treaty is still in U.S. interests? Do you still believe it can be ratified with Soviet troops in Afghanistan? Even if you are reelected, won't it be necessary to renegotiate parts of the Treaty?

A: 1. THEME

- Preventing nuclear war is the foremost responsibility of the President of the United States.
- An all-out nuclear arms race increases the risk of nuclear war.
- The Treaty is in the security interests of the United States and our allies, and I will seek its ratification as soon as feasible after the election.
- I intend then to press on in SALT III for deeper reductions and greater qualitative constraints on new weapons.
- Tearing up SALT II will unleash an arms race that will threaten our security and cost us billions. It will divide us from our allies, all of whom support SALT II.
- Governor Reagan's proposals to go on to SALT III without SALT II is naive and empty. His professed support for arms control contradicts a history of no discernable support for the arms control efforts of previous Democratic and Republican Presidents.

2. RECORD

- The SALT process, and the SALT II Treaty, which Governor Reagan would abandon, are the products of three Republican and Democratic Administrations all of which were convinced that limiting Soviet strategic arms strengthens U.S. security and reduces the risk of nuclear war.

- The benefits of this Treaty to the security interests of the U.S. are clear:

From SALT I,
T. B. ...

- Under the Treaty, the United States will not have to reduce any strategic systems, while the Soviets will have to reduce 250 and it will prevent them from deploying 600 or 700 new ones.
 - Under the Treaty, the United States will be able to carry out all our planned strategic modernization programs, including the Trident I missile, the air-launched cruise missile, and the M-X land-based missile.
 - SALT II will permit us to spend more on our highest priority needs for conventional force improvements.
 - Without SALT, we would be divided from our allies, all of whom support SALT and see it as a cornerstone of their own security.
 - If we abandon SALT, we will give the Soviet Union an enormous propaganda advantage and undermine our efforts to control the spread of nuclear weapons to other nations of the world.
- These are the benefits of the SALT Treaty. I want the American people to understand clearly what the consequences of a world without the SALT Treaty, a world which Governor Reagan apparently wants, would be like:
 - Without SALT, the Soviets could deploy over 3,000 strategic bombers and missiles, instead of the 2,250 they are allowed under the Treaty.
 - Without SALT, the Soviets could deploy as many warheads on their large missiles as they are capable of carrying, fifteen or twenty or even more on each missile instead of ten.
 - Without SALT, the Soviets could target an additional three to six thousand more warheads on American cities and military targets than they would under the Treaty.
 - Without SALT, defense planning by our military leaders would be much more difficult. The M-X program, a central element in our planned strategic modernization, would be harder to

design and to build, and more costly, because we could not know what the size of Soviet forces would be and would have to predict the worst.

- Without SALT, our ability to monitor Soviet forces -- and thus to evaluate Soviet capabilities -- would be reduced, because the Soviets would be freed from the SALT constraints on deliberate concealment of strategic forces.
- Without SALT, the likely increase in Soviet strategic capabilities would require us to spend even more on defense, perhaps on the order of an additional \$30 to \$100 billion over a 10 year period. This would compound our already difficult budget choices. We would of course spend what is necessary for our security, but with SALT, it would be less.

We did not negotiate this Treaty to make friends with the Soviet Union. We negotiated it because we are adversaries, and it is in our security interest to have reliable, effective and verifiable limits on Soviet forces. The Treaty helps reduce the risk of nuclear war.

3. REAGAN

- Governor Reagan says he will withdraw the SALT Treaty from the Senate and "immediately open negotiations on a SALT III Treaty" for arms reductions.

At the same time, Governor Reagan will launch on an effort to outbuild the Soviets in an attempt to frighten them into negotiations for a new agreement.

Governor Reagan says our allies do not really support the Treaty. He says it was dead in the Senate before Afghanistan.

- Nothing Governor Reagan has said betrays more clearly his dangerous misunderstanding of foreign affairs than his statements on SALT.

- What would we do if the Russians tore up SALT and threatened an arms race and asked for immediate negotiations? Governor Reagan is naive if he thinks the Soviets would react differently. Governor Reagan's course means one thing: renewal of the nuclear arms race, and collapse of the negotiating process.

• tear up SALT II
• play trump card of
arms control
• under inquiry

COPY
JUN 21 1983

Part - direct

- What would the Governor propose on SALT III? He wants a buildup in strategic forces, but he also wants reductions. He should tell the American people what U.S. systems he is prepared to dis-mantle if he is sincere about getting further Soviet reductions.
- The Governor is reported to have over 100 people working on the so-called October Surprise Committee. Well, the surprise is that Governor Reagan is in favor of arms control. He certainly has never before favored any of the arms control accomplishments of any Presidents -- Republican or Democrat.
- The Governor's argument that the allies secretly are against SALT is a dangerous misperception, perhaps more dangerous than his misunderstanding of China. Throwing out SALT II will divide us from our allies and give the Soviets the propaganda windfall. Our efforts to modernize theater nuclear forces in Europe will be put in jeopardy. The Europeans will seek to disassociate themselves from Governor Reagan's arms race policy. The result will be a divided alliance and a dangerous increase in Soviet influence.
- Governor Reagan's assertion that SALT II was dead before the Soviets invaded Afghanistan shows that he has at least one thing in common with the Soviet Union. They now also make that claim as a way of justifying their invasion of Afghanistan.

4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

- I believe that the Senate will ratify SALT II because the Treaty is, in its simplest terms, in the interest of our Nation's security. It forces the Soviets to reduce, while we carry out essential strategic modernization.
- Governor Reagan and the Republican Party would abandon SALT and the arms control process build up by every President since Eisenhower. He would sacrifice the important contributions the Treaty makes to U.S. security.
- Governor Reagan would leave us in an uncontrolled nuclear arms race. There is no way to predict how long it would take to reconstruct the arms control process. The risk of nuclear war would increase.

U.S.-Soviet Relations

Q: Mr. President, why has your Administration failed to manage successfully the U.S.-Soviet relationship, the key factor in international relations? How have we reached this point of tension, deteriorating relations and renewed military competition? What would you do in a second Administration to put U.S.-Soviet relations back on an even keel?

A: 1. THEME

- That relations between the United States and the Soviet Union are severely strained is undeniable. And that this strain is largely created by Soviet behavior is also undeniable.
- A stable, balanced relationship with the Soviet Union remains my goal.
- But, stable relations -- detente -- cannot be divorced from deterrence. The Soviets must understand that they cannot at the same time threaten world peace and still enjoy the benefits of cooperation with the U.S. Cooperation or competition -- the choice is up to the Soviet Union. The United States will respond to either.
- But not all problems in this world are carried by the U.S.S.R. Dealing with poverty, hunger, political oppression, the spread of nuclear weapons are also vital to our security and cannot be ignored.

2. RECORD

- The Soviet Union has used its increasing military capabilities to seek to increase its influence in the Third World. With extraordinary shortsightedness, it has done so in the belief that these actions would not undermine detente with the United States and the West.
- This Soviet calculation was clearly wrong. Our relations with the Soviet Union have reached the lowest point in years, particularly accentuated by the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.

- This attempt to subjugate an independent, non-aligned Islamic people is a violation of international law and the United Nations Charter, two fundamentals of international order. Hence, it is also a dangerous threat to world peace.
- The firm actions the United States has taken in recent months -- on grain sales, on technology, on fishing rights, in exchanges and on the Olympics -- are meant to demonstrate that aggression bears a price.
- Most Americans support the steps we have taken. For they understand that we cannot express our national resolve without individual sacrifice -- from farmers, from businessmen, from athletes, and others. Governor Reagan apparently does not understand this. He has opposed many of the steps we have taken.
- When we undertook these policies, we had no illusions that they would bring about an immediate reconsideration of Soviet policy.
- It will take time for the Soviet Union to reassess its policy. When it does, we are prepared to consider realistic arrangements to restore a neutral, nonaligned Afghanistan. With the withdrawal of Soviet troops, we would end our sanctions.
- We must recognize, however that not all of our difficulties in the world today can be blamed on the Soviet Union, as Governor Reagan has suggested. The world is much more diverse, interdependent, and unstable than in the past. There is no question that the Soviets, when they feel they can get away with it, will take every opportunity to expand their influence at Western expense. But we forget our world leadership role when we blind ourselves to the realities of the problems we face by fixing our attention too rigidly on the Soviets.
- The profound differences in what our two governments believe about freedom and power and the inner lives of human beings are likely to remain for the indefinite future, and so are other elements of competition between the United States and the Soviet Union. That competition is real and deeply rooted in the history and values of our respective societies.

- But it is also true that since our two countries can destroy the world, we share many important, overlapping responsibilities. We will seek to translate these into concrete understandings, if the Soviet Union is prepared to exercise restraint. If not, we shall be prepared for any challenge to our interests.

3. REAGAN

- Governor Reagan has a very simple view of U.S.-Soviet relations: The Soviet Union is behind all the unrest in the world; if they would behave, there would be no "hot spots" in the world.

Does he believe they are behind Khomenei

Governor Reagan has an equally simple answer to Afghanistan: blockade Cuba, cut off all communication with the Soviet Union, send U.S. advisers and military equipment to Pakistan, and funnel arms to the Afghan insurgents.

But, when it came to action instead of words, Governor Reagan opposed or temporized on many of the specific measures I took to bring home to the Soviets the costs of aggression:

- He opposed the grain embargo, though he has long advocated halting grain sales to the Soviet Union as a moral issue. He wanted to stop grain sales after the disclosure of the Soviet brigade in Cuba.
- Governor Reagan at first suggested an Olympic boycott, then he swung against it, then finally said it was for the athletes to decide.
- He opposed draft registration, one of the most convincing signals of our determination.

- Governor Reagan believes the Cold War never ended, so he would see no loss in a return to an arms race and to the end of detente.
- Governor Reagan believes the Soviets are marching with the tide of history. This is nonsense. Over the past several years, the Soviet Union has lost as much influence in the World as it has gained, starting with the People's Republic of China in the late 1950s. Indonesia, Egypt and Somalia have all sent the Soviets packing. They are not

He also says
is a flat-out victory
failures will
Does he believe they are behind Khomenei
we have gained
Egypt
Somalia
China
they have gained
Angola
Mozambique
??

we have gained
Indonesia
Egypt
Somalia
China
they have gained
Angola
Mozambique
??

alone. The Soviet Union has fewer friends in the Third World today than a decade ago. We have moved America to the forefront of world history not only because of our technology, but also because our dedication to democracy, human rights and human justice makes us a beacon to the oppressed everywhere.

4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

- The way to better relations is open if the Soviets alter their conduct. That is clearly the path we prefer. We seek no Cold War, no indiscriminate confrontation. But we will insist that Moscow respect the legitimate interests of the United States and of other nations.
- The American people understand that our relationship with the Soviet Union contains elements of competition and confrontation as well as cooperation. Our differences are profound. But it is also true that our two countries share many important interests, survival being the most critical. We must, therefore, attempt to avoid the excessive swings in our policies toward the Soviet Union, and pursue a steady, firm course of cooperation where it serves our interests, as in the SALT Treaty, and be prepared for confrontation in competition if this is necessary.
- Ahead lies the uncertainty of the directions in which a new generation of leadership will take the Soviet Union, in the solution of its internal problems, and the advancement of its interests abroad. With steadfastness and patience, we can affect the choices they will make, but if we give way to fear and if we cut off all communications as Governor Reagan urged after Afghanistan, we may well see the next generation of Soviet leaders fulfilling our worst nightmares.

*Give something
about the new
Soviet leader*

Western Alliance

Q: President Carter, Republicans and other critics say there has been a loss of European confidence in your personal leadership and in the reliability of the United States. Critics say your policies and leadership have been erratic, with sudden flip flops. The neutron bomb is one example; the stress on human rights in certain areas and not in others another, and our arms sales policies a third.

Governor Reagan has said: "I think there is every indication that some of our European friends are beginning to wonder if they shouldn't look more toward -- or have a rapprochement with -- the Soviet Union, because they are not sure whether we are dependable or not."

When your Administration began, you said strengthening the Atlantic Alliance would be one of your principal aims. Yet, over the last four years the U.S. and the NATO allies seem to be drifting apart on a whole range of important issues: East-West relations, defense policies, energy problems, inflation and economic stagnation, relations with the Third World, the Middle East -- the list could go on. Isn't it clear NATO is in serious disarray? Can the Alliance remain unified and effective in the face of such deep problems?

A: 1. THEME

The NATO Alliance is as strong today as it has been at anytime in my memory. Under U.S. leadership, NATO has developed a broad, coordinated and cohesive strategy for strengthening the Alliance. The Atlantic Alliance, together with our Alliances with Japan, Australia, and New Zealand, is now and will remain the bedrock of Western collective security.

2. RECORD

- When I took office, the Alliance was indeed troubled. We faced serious security problems in Europe, with no common plan for dealing with them.
- A central objective of my Administration was to devise an effective response to the Alliance disarray we inherited from the previous Republican Administration.
- At the 1978 NATO Summit, the NATO Allies agreed to join with us in increasing real defense spending by 3% every year until 1986.
- In 1978 we launched a Long Term Defense Program to improve NATO's capabilities in ten key areas, ranging from air defense to maritime posture. This program is being vigorously implemented.

- NATO has made a historic decision to modernize theater nuclear forces with the deployment of long-range Pershing and Ground-Launched Cruise Missiles in Europe which can strike the Soviet Union.
- But, our Allies can do more. The commitments they made in 1978 are all the more important in light of the security situation in Southwest Asia. NATO must face the possibility that U.S. forces we previously had hoped would be available for the defense of Europe might have to be committed to a conflict or crisis elsewhere, especially Southwest Asia.
- We have recently discussed this situation with our Allies and have agreed with them that we need to accelerate implementation of critical Long-Term Defense Program measures, and some countries must make a renewed effort to achieve three percent real growth in defense spending.

3. REAGAN

- Unlike Governor Reagan, I do not accuse our allies of drifting toward "neutrality" or a desire to accommodate the Soviet Union. An Alliance which is vigorously implementing a Long-Term Defense Program to improve its collective military capabilities, which is committed to increasing real defense spending by 3%, and which has decided to implement a major modernization of theater nuclear forces, is not trying to appease the Soviet Union. It is nonsense, and damaging to the Alliance, to make such a charge.
- Governor Reagan says he would consult with the allies and show them we value the Alliance. Governor Reagan's advisers must not have briefed him well on the record of consultations with NATO over the last three and one half years. I have met with allied leaders in five summits. I have had innumerable bilateral discussions with individual allied leaders on every issue confronting the Alliance today. Secretaries Vance, Muskie and Brown have met dozens of times bilaterally and in NATO with their counterparts. The record will show an unprecedented volume of correspondence and exchange at the highest levels with our Allies on major foreign policy issues, most of it quite sensitive. In short, no U.S. Administration has consulted as intensively with the Allies as has mine.

- As an example of his forceful policies, Governor Reagan says he would deploy the "neutron bomb" in Europe. This betrays an insensitivity to European political concerns that could cause serious strains in the Alliance. Governor Reagan ignores one essential fact: NATO is an Alliance of sovereign states. We do not tell our Allies that we are going to deploy a weapon their territory. We consult with them, we examine the military requirements, we consider the political implications, then we as an Alliance decide.

4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

- Over the past three and one-half years, NATO has taken several major decisions to strengthen conventional and nuclear forces, to increase real defense spending, and redistribute security burdens in the Alliance so the U.S. can direct more effort at protecting our common interests in the Persian Gulf.
- This has been achieved under U.S. leadership. Without a vigorous effort by myself, my top foreign policy and defense advisors and the concerted effort of my Administration, NATO could not have organized and begun the difficult task of implementing this tremendous effort. I am proud of what we have accomplished and I am determined that we shall do even more to strengthen the Alliance.
- NATO is a healthy, strong alliance of free, equal and sovereign nations. From time to time, disagreements among free allies over the proper responses to the challenges we are facing is understandable. But, our common goals -- mutual security and preservation of our democratic way of life -- are deep and enduring. We should work even harder at coordinating our actions in Europe and wherever our interest are threatened. But the Alliance is dynamic and vibrant; it is not in disarray.

Persian Gulf

Q: President Carter, your critics have charged that we can't affect the course of the war between Iraq and Iran because we haven't built a policy or a position there. Hence we are neutral in the conflict. What have you done about that region and, if the war should escalate in the near future, does the United States have the capability to protect our vital interests in the region?

A: 1. THEME

In recent years the Persian Gulf has become vital to the United States and to many of our friends and allies. Over the longer term, the world's dependence on Persian Gulf oil is likely to increase. The denial of these oil supplies -- to us or to others -- would threaten our security and provoke an economic crisis greater than that of the Great Depression 50 years ago. Loss of this oil would create havoc not only in the world economy, but for the security of our alliances. The twin threats to the flow of Persian Gulf oil -- from regional instability and from the current conflict between Iraq and Iran, and potentially from the Soviet Union as a result of its invasion of Afghanistan -- require that we assist our friends in the region to enhance their security and that we clearly state our intention to defend our vital interests if threatened.

2. RECORD

- I ~~long ago~~ *have always* recognized the growing importance of the Persian Gulf, not just to other oil importing nations, but also to us. That's one reason I have pushed so hard on an energy policy -- which means that we are now importing 24% less oil now than when I was inaugurated. That also means that worldwide oil stocks are at an all-time high, so that both Iraqi and Iranian oil could come off the world market without causing a real crisis.
- We have also been building up our ability to act in our own interests, and those of our friends in the area, if that became necessary. We are creating a Rapid Deployment Force; we have prepositioned military stocks; we have two carrier battle groups in the region; we are making more use of the Diego Garcia base; and we have agreements giving us access to military facilities in Oman, Kenya, and Somalia.

- It was no accident, therefore, that we were able to keep the Iran-Iraq war from spreading to the oil areas of the Gulf a few weeks ago. And it is no accident that we have the ability to keep open the Strait of Hormuz -- through which 60% of the world's exportable oil flows -- no matter what efforts are made to close it.
- As for the war itself, we have strongly supported international efforts, in the United Nations and elsewhere, to end the fighting and to bring Iran and Iraq to the negotiating table.
- I have exchanged letters with President Brezhnev about the situation. It is my belief that the Soviets do not want war to break out in a general way throughout the Persian Gulf. The biggest threat to our security would be if the Soviets should be tempted to move into Iran or to move into an area where they can control the Persian Gulf itself or the access to it. This would be a direct threat, not only to our own security, but the security of other western nations who depend on oil supplies from that region for economic well-being. President Brezhnev is fully aware of our views.
- We are also working to keep the conflict from spreading beyond Iran and Iraq. To this end we are helping our non-belligerent friends in the area who are threatened by this conflict. My decision to send advance warning-and-control aircraft to Saudi Arabia underscores our determination to strengthen the defenses of such friends -- so that they can guard their own independence and territorial integrity. We are also urging all other nations - in the region and beyond - to avoid involvement and to work to limit and resolve the fighting. It is in no one's interest to see the hostilities widen.
- Finally, we have pledged to do what is necessary to protect free shipping in the Strait of Hormuz from any interference. We have the ability to meet this pledge.

3. REAGAN

- We are told that greater American military might could have prevented the course of events in Iran. Governor Reagan has said that there was

a time that the revolt against the Shah could have been halted. He didn't say exactly how. But the fact is that in the world as it is, American military forces cannot provide a satisfactory solution to the internal problems of other nations. If we tried to order the affairs of other nations by force, we would be endlessly at war all over the globe. And how would we then differ from the Soviet Union and its actions in Afghanistan or Ethiopia?

4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

- Enhancing the security of the Persian Gulf region and the Middle East will require a sustained, long-term commitment. We are prepared to make such a commitment. We want to work with all of the countries in the region to achieve it. The present conflict between Iraq and Iran underscores the vital importance of this task.

Iran: Hostages

Q: Mr. President, fifty-two Americans remain captive in Iran. The response of your Administration has been to try several diplomatic initiatives, invoke economic sanctions against Iran and attempt a military rescue mission. The latter, we know, was a failure. Less clear has been the effect of the diplomatic initiatives and economic sanctions. Now, of course, we have the war between Iran and Iraq which has further complicated the release of our hostages.

Now that you have had the perspective of time and thought, please evaluate for us the effectiveness of the diplomatic and economic measures you have taken, and the wisdom of the rescue mission and why it collapsed. Finally, what do you propose we do now to win the release of the hostages?

A: 1. THEME

No single international issue has caused me greater personal concern as President than the continued, illegal detention of our hostages in Iran. Since the first day the hostages were taken, we have kept two goals in mind. First, to preserve the honor and integrity of our Nation and to protect its interests. Second, to take no action in this country that would endanger the lives of safety of the hostages nor interfere with their earliest possible release back to freedom.

2. RECORD

- International condemnation of Iran, the economic sanctions which we have imposed, and now the war with Iraq, have raised the costs to Iran of their illegal actions and are bringing home to Iranians the fact that the holding of the hostages is hurting their country and bringing dishonor to their revolution.
- But divisions with Iran have prevented progress, and this has been my greatest frustration as President.
- I have no regret that we attempted to rescue our hostages. Our rescue plan was well conceived and had an excellent chance of success.
- Our intelligence information is that the hostages are alive and safe, and that the Iranian authorities are not mistreating them.

- I believe the Iraq-Iran war has not endangered the hostages' lives. But, it has complicated our efforts to gain their release.
- There are rumors that we are prepared to trade the hostages for spare parts for Iranian military equipment. There is no such proposal, no such deal.
NO President would do dishonor America!
- I cannot, for obvious reasons, go into any details about our continuing diplomatic efforts. However, we have made it clear from the very beginning that we were prepared to meet at any time or any place with anyone authorized to speak with authority on behalf of the Iranian government on this issue. The reluctance has always been on the side of Iran, because of their own internal political considerations. This problem can be solved and it will be solved. But I cannot say when a solution will be reached.
- I also understand the intense interest and speculation on the nature of any agreement which might lead to the release of the hostages. I have consistently refused to comment on the Iranian conditions or the possible U.S. response. This is not an issue which is going to be solved by a public exchange. It must be handled in diplomatic channels out of the glare of publicity.

3. REAGAN

- Governor Reagan believes we should have issued an ultimatum to Iran. He also wanted to "literally quarantine" Iran.

4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

- We have pursued a policy of firmness and restraint. We have not issued ultimata, as Governor Reagan has said he would do. Nor have we attempted to "literally quarantine" Iran as he has suggested. I believe such actions would be reckless and would pose a serious threat to the lives of the hostages.
- I can't mislead you by saying that there are some immediate prospects that the hostages will be released. My hope and prayer is that they will be and I believe that we have made as much effort as possible to secure their safe return.

Middle East Peace Process

Q: President Carter, there has been no progress in the autonomy talks between Egypt and Israel. None is expected until after the November election, if then. Many believe that the autonomy issues are so intractable that the Camp David process is finished. The Europeans have apparently reached this conclusion.

Would it not be fair to say that the Middle East peace process is at a dead end? Would it not be better to start on a new approach?

And, isn't it true that Israeli intransigence on West Bank settlements and the status of Jerusalem are the real roadblocks to peace in the Middle East. Shouldn't the United States bring pressure to bear on Israel to change its policy on these issues?

A: 1. THEME

My Administration has sought to achieve peaceful resolutions of disputes in troubled areas of the world -- in Africa, Latin America and the Middle East. Regional conflicts pose the danger of wider confrontations and draw the interest of the Soviet Union to exploit disorder. We can take satisfaction that real progress in the pursuit of peace has been made.

2. RECORD

- When I took office, peace in the Middle East was only a prayer. There had been four wars in 30 years between Israel and her neighbors.
- Two years ago Prime Minister Begin and President Sadat joined me at Camp David. Last year they signed a peace treaty at the White House between their two countries.
- Today, Israel and Egypt are at peace. Ambassadors have been exchanged; borders have been opened; two-thirds of the Sinai has been returned to Egypt.
- I am very proud of this accomplishment. It was achieved through patient negotiation and hard work, by all parties. It was not achieved through coercion or pressure.

Today the largest Arab nation is at peace with Israel!

- In this regard, the United States has no intention of pressuring Israel to make concessions in the autonomy negotiations. And there can be no peace in the Middle East unless Israel is secure. I am committed to that security:
 - nearly half of all U.S. aid to Israel since its creation as a sovereign state - more than \$10 billion - has been requested during my Administration.
 - just recently our two countries signed a five-year agreement guaranteeing Israel access to U.S. oil if it cannot obtain its own supplies on the world market. You will remember that Israel made a great sacrifice in agreeing to give up control of the Sinai oil fields as part of the Camp David accords and peace treaty.
- Despite the accomplishments of the Camp David process, much remains to be done. Camp David led to the peace treaty between Egypt and Israel. It also established the framework for a comprehensive peace among all parties in the region. Progress has been made toward that goal.
- Two weeks ago the chief Israeli and Egyptian negotiators in the autonomy talks met in Washington. Our special Mideast negotiator, Sol Linowitz, reported that the two sides were moving closer to agreement. The negotiators will meet again on November 17. And I hope to meet with Prime Minister Begin and President Sadat shortly after that. We have come this far; we don't intend to fail.

3. REAGAN

- Governor Reagan has said that the United States should not try to impose a settlement on the Middle East or dictate its will. I would simply remind him that neither the Camp David accords nor the peace treaty between Egypt and Israel were imposed by the United States. Both were achieved through patient and persistent negotiation and hard work, not coercion. I would also remind Governor Reagan that,

at the request of both Israel and Egypt, the United States is currently involved as a full partner in the autonomy negotiations. As Camp David demonstrated, the United States can contribute in a major way to the peace process -- not by imposing its will -- but by acting as a catalyst, and by helping the parties overcome difficult issues.

- I also find it somewhat surprising that Governor Reagan would express such concern about the United States imposing a settlement on the Middle East when he has made just the opposite recommendation for other disputes around the world, including Lebanon, Cyprus, Ecuador and Rhodesia, among others. In each of these instances he suggested that the United States should use, or threaten to use, military force to resolve the dispute. Governor Reagan's concern for imposing settlements appears to be selective at best.

4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

- The Camp David process has brought peace between Israel and Egypt. This is an historic accomplishment and one that all Americans can be proud of. - During my next term, I hope to see all parties at peace in the Middle East.
- Camp David has not resolved all the problems in the Middle East. But let me remind you of this. It is the first time that the two issues of Israeli security and Palestinian rights -- issues at the heart of the Arab-Israeli conflict -- have been at the top of the agenda together. And no other approach has been suggested, by Governor Reagan or anyone else, that can do that.

US Policy Toward China

Q: United States policy toward the People's Republic of China and toward Taiwan surfaced early as a major foreign policy issue in this campaign.

President Carter, do you believe it would be possible to upgrade our unofficial relationship with Taiwan without doing damage to our relations with the PRC? More generally, what do you see as the major benefits to date of your decision to normalize relations with the PRC?

A: 1. THEME

When I assumed office in 1977, I set two central tasks - to improve America's political position in the world and to improve our strategic condition. Normalization of relations with China has made a positive contribution to both these objectives.

2. RECORD

- I am very pleased with the progress we have made in U.S.-China relations. When I took office in 1977, our relations were at a standstill. The leaders of the People's Republic were unsure of the reliability of the United States and of our determination to respond to Soviet activities around the globe. The deadlock in our relations was broken in December, 1978, when I announced that we would formally recognize the PRC.
- Since that time, the benefits of normalization have become clear. Trade, travel, cultural exchange and, most of all, the security and stability of the Pacific region is greater now than at any time in this century. And, for the first time in our history we have good relations with both China and Japan.

3. REAGAN

- I am very concerned that Governor Reagan's ill-advised and confused statements on Taiwan and China may place these important accomplishments in jeopardy. If the United States were to adopt Governor Reagan's position on Taiwan, I believe the damage to our important strategic relationship with China would be severe. Perhaps he does not understand that the resumption of an official relationship with Taiwan would not only be contrary to the January 1979 Joint Communiqué we negotiated and agreed to with China, but would void all of the preliminary understandings beginning with the Shanghai Communiqué President Nixon agreed to in 1972.

- Governor Reagan's concern about Taiwan also is ill-informed. At the time of normalization, I made it clear that we would continue practical relations with the people of Taiwan, but without an official relationship, and that we would do nothing to jeopardize the well-being of the people of Taiwan. We have fulfilled that commitment. There has been no betrayal of Taiwan. In fact, Taiwan has done exceedingly well since derecognition. The clearest evidence of this is that United States trade with Taiwan is at an all-time high and that tension in the strait between Taiwan and the People's Republic is at an all-time low.
- I hope that Governor Reagan now understands the importance of our relationship with the People's Republic of China. He didn't in 1978 when he said "it is hard to see what is in it for us." Beyond the questions of trade and cultural exchanges, the fact is that our national security is enhanced by our relationship with the PRC. What Governor Reagan has not understood is that a strong, peaceful and secure China is in our national interest. A China confident in its ability to defend its border enhances stability in the Far East and contributes to our security and that of our allies.

4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

- Over the next four years I hope to see our new relationship with China grow. At the same time, we have no intention of improving our relations with China for tactical advantage against the Soviet Union. We are developing our relations with China on their own merits. We want good relations with China and the Soviet Union, but we will not slow down progress in U.S.-China relations just because Soviet behavior makes it impossible to move ahead with Moscow.
- We will not sell arms to China. Neither we nor the Chinese seek a military alliance relationship. Nevertheless, we can and will assist China's drive to improve its security by permitting appropriate technology transfer, including the sale of dual use technology and defensive military equipment.
- In the absence of frontal assaults of our common interests, the United States and China will remain -- as at present -- friends rather than allies.

Central America

Q: President Carter, next to the Persian Gulf, perhaps the most most volatile region of the world today is Central America. No country seems immune from the revolutionary fervor sweeping the region. The Republicans have sharply criticized your policy there. They state you have stood by while Castro's Cuba -- assisted by the Soviet Union -- arms, trains and supports revolutionary forces throughout the region.

The Republicans further state that they do not support United States assistance to any Marxist government in this hemisphere and, specifically, oppose your aid program for the government of Nicaragua.

On few foreign policy issues are the lines so tightly drawn between your policies and those of the Republicans. How do you account for this sharp policy difference? Do you believe the Cubans and Soviets are responsible for the turmoil in Central America? How best can the United States influence the direction of the change sweeping through the region?

A: 1. THEME

It is important for Americans to recognize that we live in a changing world, a world of diversity and turmoil. Scores of new nations have emerged since the Second World War. The international landscape has been fundamentally altered. We must seek positive relations around the world not because we have a compulsion to be liked but because our interests are at stake. We cannot return to the 1950's, a time of unique American military and economic preparedness in this hemisphere and the world. By attempting to understand and identify with the world as it is, the United States is in a much better position to channel this change in a constructive fashion and to resolve regional disputes. The turmoil in Center America today is a test of America's ability to deal constructively with global change.

2. RECORD

- Those who are most concerned about the potential for radical revolution in Central America and growing Cuban influence in the region should be the strongest supporters of our efforts to help Nicaragua and El Salvador. But, Governor Reagan is not.

- We are encouraged that Nicaraguan moderates and businessmen have chosen to stay in Nicaragua and help work to make it a more democratic country. They have asked for our help, and we will not abandon them. They have asked for our economic assistance. We have provided it, most recently in the form of a \$75 million economic package to Nicaragua.
- In El Salvador, we have been encouraged by the changes and reforms that the new government began implementing. The government there is moderate, reformist and interested in a productive relationship with the United States. We are providing more than \$70 million of economic assistance.

3. REAGAN

- Governor Reagan seems to believe that Cuban and the Soviet Union are behind all the problems in Central America. In fact, Governor Reagan has said: "The Soviet Union underlies all the unrest that is going on. If they weren't engaged in the game of dominoes, there wouldn't be any hot spots in the world." If he expects to forge a policy toward the hemisphere based on that perception, he is in for a surprise. The people of Latin America and the Caribbean do not view the struggle between the East and West as their principal problem; they care about food and freedom, and, under my Administration, we have formulated an approach which identifies with those two aspirations.
- I was pleased to hear that Governor Reagan intends to initiate a program of "intensive economic development with cooperating countries in the Caribbean." He might be interested in knowing that he has proposed a program that is already in existence. Since I took office, the United States has more than doubled its aid to the Caribbean and, working with the 30 nations and 15 international institutions known as the Caribbean Group. Multilateral assistance to the region has increased by 400 percent between 1976 and 1980.
- Governor Reagan has sharply criticized the presence of the Soviet combat brigade in Cuba, and my handling of this issue. After the discovery of the brigade, I took steps to insure that Soviet activities in Cuba would in no way constitute a threat to the United States or the region. I have increased surveillance of Cuba, expanded military maneuvers

Human Rights

Q: President Carter, your Administration has made espousal of human rights a central theme of your foreign policy. Some argue that you have persisted in advocating human rights even when it has damaged other U.S. interests and weakened regimes friendly to the United States. The Republicans charge that you have pressed hardest on our friends and little on Marxist regimes with the worst human rights records, such as the Soviet Union, Vietnam and Cuba.

You have contrasted your pursuit of human rights and "morality" in foreign affairs with the supposed indifference to these considerations by the previous Administration. In view of the charge that your pursuit of human rights has harmed U.S. interests in key areas such as Iran, Central America and Africa, do you intend to continue to assert this as a global, universal U.S. objective? Are you now ready to show more discrimination and weigh other U.S. objectives as well, before attacking a regime for alleged abuses?

A: 1. THEME

In my Inaugural Address I emphasized our commitment as a nation to human rights. Human rights is as central to America's interests today as when our nation was first born. We know from our own national experience that the drive for human freedom has tremendous force. Our human rights policy identifies America with the basic aspirations of our time.

2. RECORD

- I regard making human rights an essential element of American foreign policy and an item on the agenda of every major international organization a major accomplishment of my Administration.
- We have made it clear that the United States believes that torture cannot be tolerated under any circumstances, and that officially sanctioned "disappearances" are abhorrent in any society. We have insisted on the right of free movement everywhere. And we have worked hard to give aid to the world's refugees, compelled to flee from oppression and hardship.

- I believe our words and actions have left their mark on the world. Many governments have released their political prisoners. Others have lifted states of seige, curtailed indiscriminate arrests, and reduced the use of torture. We have seen several dictatorships, some of them in this hemisphere, change into democracies. And, because of our leadership, the defense of human rights now has its rightful place on the world agenda.

3. REAGAN

- The Republican Party has stated that it will return to the fundamental principle of treating a friend as a friend, without apology. I do not believe that we should simply drop our human rights concerns because a country is anti-communist. Not when that country imprisons and tortures its citizens.
- *Verify* Governor Reagan has said: "Isn't it time we laid off South Africa for awhile?" Does he really mean that we should no longer express our strong opposition to the racist and repugnant South Africa policy of apartheid? He has also referred to "a few innocents" - being caught in the crossfire of violence in Argentina. Did he not know when he made this statement that between 1976 and 1979 there were at least 6,500 cases of unexplained disappearances in that country?
- Governor Reagan has also suggested that the United States should stay away from the upcoming Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe in Madrid, that we should drop out of the Helsinki process. To do so would be folly. It would only please those who are most guilty of violating the principles of Helsinki, including human rights. I do not intend to let the Soviet Union and other violators be freed of their obligation to account for their actions before world opinion. A Republican administration signed the Helsinki Accords in 1975. My Democratic Administration is committed to carrying out those agreements.

4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

- o My commitment to human rights is as deep and important to me today as it was when I became President. My own faith in the ultimate outcome of this struggle is undimmed. The American people can be proud of the role the United States is playing in promoting human rights around the world.
- o Human rights is not just an expression of our ideals. The tide in the world is running toward human rights and it is in our national security interests to support it. Our support for human rights also enables us to regain the political high ground in the competition for world influence. It stands in vivid contrast to the practices of the Soviet Union.
- o One of the best ways to express our commitment to human rights is to quote from the words of Archibald MacLeish, "There are those who will say that the liberation of humanity, the freedom of man and mind, is nothing but a dream. They are right. It is. It's the American dream."

Future Goals

Q: What are your top foreign policy and national security priorities for a second term?

A: 1. THEME

I recognize that we live in an age of complexity, of change, of political and social awakening of peoples who demand a share of their own destiny. My foreign policy goals have been designed to identify America with global change, to promote the rule of law over the use of force, to recapture a moral and political leadership role for America, and to keep America strong both through its alliances and its own defense efforts.

2. RECORD

- o As with my first term, I will not back away from the difficult and controversial issues which confront our Nation. I have no intention of looking for easy answers or quick fixes. Rather, I will continue to seek solutions that are meaningful and lasting and in long-term interests of the United States.
- o First, we will continue, as we have over the past four years, to build America's military strength and strong defense and economic relations with our allies and friends.
- o Second, we will continue to demonstrate to the Soviet Union that a price will be paid for its refusal to abide by the accepted norms of international conduct. At the same time, we will make it clear to the Soviet Union that we seek no return to the Cold War, no indiscriminate confrontation. The choice is the Soviet Union's, we will respond to either.
- o Third, we will remain deeply committed to the process of mutual and verifiable arms control and the effort to prevent the spread and further development of nuclear weapons. I intend to push for the ratification of the SALT II Treaty as soon as possible after the election.
- o Fourth, we will pursue an active diplomacy in the world, working -- together with our friends and allies -- to resolve regional conflicts and to promote peace -- in the Middle East, and Persian Gulf, southern Africa, Central America, the Eastern Mediterranean.

- Fifth, we will strive to resolve pressing international economic problems -- particularly energy and inflation -- and continue to pursue our still larger objective of global economic growth through expanded trade and development assistance.
- Finally, and underlying all that we do, we will continue vigorously to support the process of building democratic institutions and improving human rights protection around the world.

3. REAGAN

- Unlike my opponent, I do not believe a lasting world order is achievable by substituting the threat intervention for diplomacy, by suggesting that we quarantine those nations which challenge our interests, or by seeking to regain an unachievable military superiority at an unimaginable cost.
- Unlike my opponent, I do not believe we are a weak and floundering Nation, dismissed with contempt by our enemies, abandoned by our allies and sinking into decline as a major power. Rather, I know, our resolve is steady, our military is powerful, our alliances are strong and we are gaining new friends among the young nations of the world.
- Unlike my opponent, I do not believe we can return to an early day when American interests went unchallenged in the world arena. The world of today is a world of upheaval and unrest and will be for decades to come. But, as a powerful and self-confident nation, we can live with a good deal of turmoil in the world while we protect our interests and be a friend to those who seek a new life free from tyranny.
- Unlike my opponent, I would not return us to the days of the Cold War. I do not believe, as he does, that the Soviet Union is responsible for all the unrest in the world today. The world is much too diverse for such a simple explanation. But I will continue to insist, through our actions and our words, that the Soviet Union respect the legitimate interest of other nations.
- Unlike my opponent, I would not accuse our allies of leaning toward accommodation with the Soviet Union. Leading an alliance of proud sovereign nations requires

tact, patience and understanding. We and our allies share profound political, security and economic interests, but we must never forget that ours is an association of free peoples, and the United States must lead, not dictate.

- o Unlike my opponent, I would not abandon the arms control process, which has contributed to our Nation's security and has taken so many years to construct. That would be the consequence of his intention to scrap the SALT II Treaty.
- o Unlike my opponent, I would not jeopardize our new relationship with the People's Republic of China by tampering with the form of our good relations with the people of Taiwan. Our new relationship with China is clearly in our national interest and contributes to the peace and security of the Pacific region.
- o And, finally, unlike my opponent, I would not jettison human rights as a fundamental objective of U.S. foreign policy. I believe the true interests of our Nation are best served by honoring the ideals of our heritage.

4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

- o I do not believe the American people share Governor Reagan's view of the future, a world filled with fears of change and unrest and damaging self-doubts about our military capability and strength, in which foreign policy is reduced to threats, bluster and reliance on military power.
- o I have learned a good deal in my four years of office: I know more now about the limits of power; I know better how hard it is to put policies into effect; I understand how frustrating it is to see one's policies distorted and misdirected. I know that a leader cannot achieve everything he wants, or knows is desirable.
- o But, my vision remains. It is based on reality, and filled with faith and an unbending determination to achieve a life of meaning and purpose for every American in a Nation that is strong and secure. Above all, I want us to be what the founders of our Nation meant us to become -- a symbol of freedom, peace and hope throughout the world.

PRESIDENTIAL DEBATES

Foreign Policy and National Security Issues

Purpose

This briefing book is designed to assist the President in debates with Governor Reagan on foreign policy and national security issues. It may also be useful for more general campaign purposes. Although the book contains a large number of issues, it is not intended to be an exhaustive compilation of questions which might be asked. Rather, it seeks to identify the most likely questions about the President's leadership qualities and his record, based on a review of key speeches and statements by Governor Reagan, his supporters, the Republican Party platform, and critical press articles. Of the 69 questions contained in this book, twenty-three key questions have been marked with an asterisk in the table of contents.

Contents and Format

The suggested responses are drawn from speeches, press conferences and other policy statements by the President, the Secretaries of State and Defense, the Assistant for National Security Affairs, and other senior Administration officials dealing with foreign policy and national security issues. The responses are organized around basic themes of the Carter Administration and are intended to provide the basis for answering related questions. Some of the responses -- such as those relating to the conflict between Iran and Iraq -- may need to be updated depending on events.

A major focus of criticism will be that the President is incapable of leadership, indecisive, erratic, preoccupied with vague moralistic causes and unable to understand and respond to challenges to American interests. His record will be attacked as a series of unrelated, incoherent, reflexive actions to specific crises, without any guiding vision or strategy which ties individual policies or events together. Two broad responses, the first two in the book under the section entitled "Overview," have been prepared to provide a comprehensive rebuttal to such criticism.

Overall, the suggested responses seek to:

--demonstrate that the President has a concrete vision of a world order and a constancy of purpose in striving toward it;

-- emphasize the President's realism and toughness in dealing with our adversaries and in managing the complex problems of the modern world;

--highlight the specific accomplishments of the Carter Administration, and show how these relate to and support the President's goal of a stable, just world order;

--contrast the President's vision and record, and, in particular, the President's leadership qualities, with the picture formed by Governor Reagan's comments about what he would do on foreign policy and national security issues.

To support these contrasts between the President and Governor Reagan, pertinent statements by Governor Reagan are woven into the responses. In addition, where possible, relevant quotes by Governor Reagan on the different issues appear at the end of the responses.

Finally, and in addition to the questions and responses, this book contains several short papers which are meant to highlight the contrasts among the candidates and their platforms and the themes which Governor Reagan and Representative Anderson have stressed throughout their campaigns. Also, contained in this section, which is the last in the book, is a selection of the most notable quotes by Gov. Reagan on foreign policy and national security issues.

September 29, 1980

PRESIDENTIAL DEBATE BRIEFING BOOK
Foreign Policy and National Security

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Overview

- * Leadership
- ✓ * Future Goals

II. Defense Policy

- * Military Superiority vs. Essential Equivalence
- * Military Balance
- * Defense Spending
- * Strategic Program Cancellations
- * M-X (including ABM)
- * New Strategic Bomber (including Stealth controversy)
 Neutron Bomb
- * Nuclear Strategy
 Defense Manpower
 Defense Readiness
 Military Draft
 Rapid Deployment Force
 Naval Strength

III. Arms Control

- Role in US Security
- Administration Record
- * SALT Treaty
- * Soviet Compliance
 TNF Negotiations
 Sverdlovsk and the Biological Weapons Convention
 Soviet Use of Chemical Weapons in Afghanistan

IV. US-Soviet Relations

- * Response to the Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan
- * The End of Detente
 - Nature of the Soviet Union
 - Geopolitical Losses
 - Human Rights and the Soviet Union (including CSCE)

V. Western Europe and NATO

- * US Leadership
 - Detente
 - Alliance Disunity
 - Defense Efforts
 - Coup in Turkey (also Greece & Cyprus)
 - Poland

VI. Middle East and Persian Gulf

- * Iran: Hostages
- * Defense of Persian Gulf: Carter Doctrine
 - Allied Support in Persian Gulf
- * Future of the Peace Process
 - The PLO
 - US-Israeli Relations

VII. South Asia

- * Afghanistan
 - Aid to Pakistan
 - Pakistan and India Nuclear Aims

VIII. Asia and the Pacific

- * US Policy Toward China
 - Vietnam and Southeast Asia
 - Security and Human Rights in South Korea
 - Japanese Defense Expenditures

IX. Latin America

- * Central America and the Caribbean
- US Policy Toward Cuba
- Impact of Human Rights Policy
- Panama Canal Treaties

X. Africa

- Majority Rule in Southern Africa
- Soviet-Cuban Influence in Africa
- Horn of Africa

XI. Foreign Assistance and Security Assistance

XII. Global Issues

- Good Intentions/Few Accomplishments
- * Human Rights Policy
- Non-Proliferation Policy
- Arms Transfer Policy

XIII. International Economic Policy

- * Persian Gulf Oil
- North/South: Helping Poor Nations
- Trade:
 - Disincentives
 - Access to Foreign Markets
 - Increasing Productivity
 - Export Promotion
- * Japanese Autos
- Decline of the Dollar

XIV. General

- Intelligence Reform
- Refugees
- The United Nations

XV. Candidate Positions & Platforms

Reagan Themes: Foreign Policy and National Security

Most Notable Reagan Quotes

Republican Platform Charges Against the Carter Administration

Key Proposals in the 1980 Republican Platform

Anderson Themes: Foreign Policy and National Security

Key Proposals in the Anderson Platform, 1980

Key Foreign Policy and National Security Issues: Contrasts
Among the Candidates

September 25, 1980

Leadership

Q: A widespread and persistent complaint in this country and abroad about US foreign policy under the Carter Administration is that it lacks coherence and consistency. The various strands of policy are unrelated to one another, it is said, and the US lurches from one approach to another. The Administration has flip-flopped on the withdrawal of US troops from South Korea, the neutron bomb, the Soviet brigade in Cuba and Iranian policy.

The Republican Platform has charged: "For three and one half years the Carter Administration has given us a foreign policy not of consistency and credibility, but of chaos, confusion, and failure. It has produced an image of our country as a vacillating and reactive nation, unable to define its place in the world, the goals it seeks, or the means to pursue them." "No failure of the Administration has been so catastrophic as its failure of leadership," concludes the GOP Platform.

Mr. President, how do you respond to these charges?

Response:

When I took office almost four years ago, our Nation was facing a series of problems around the world -- in southern Africa, the Middle East, in our relations with our NATO allies, and on such tough questions as nuclear proliferation, SALT II negotiations, the Panama Canal treaty, human rights, and world poverty. My Administration has directly, openly and publicly addressed these and other difficult and controversial issues, some of which had been skirted or avoided in the past. A period of debate, discussion, and probing was inevitable. My goal has not been to reach quick or easy agreements, but to find solutions that are meaningful, balanced, and lasting.

I have a vision of a more just, more secure and more stable world from which I have not wavered, and to which my Administration has directed all its efforts.

I believe an enduring world order means a world capable of peaceful change -- not a "status quo" world -- because change is and will continue to be for the foreseeable future a constant in international affairs. I have been striving for a strong, confident and progressive America leading the non-communist world in devising peaceful solutions to our many challenges. I want an international order which recognizes the basic human rights of each individual, and which understands and responds to the deep strivings of all peoples for a decent life, for food and education for their families, for democratic government and for hope for a better future.

Unlike my opponent, Governor Reagan, I do not believe a lasting world order is achievable by substituting the threat of intervention for diplomacy, by suggesting that we quarantine those nations which challenge our interests, or by seeking to regain an unachievable military "superiority" at unimaginable cost. I understand the need for a strong and powerful military in the present unstable international situation. And, let there be no mistake; if our vital national interests are threatened, I will use force to protect them. But, I will not order American troops into combat whenever there is an international disturbance that is not to our liking.

Unlike Governor Reagan, I would not abandon the arms control process, which has taken so many years to construct. That would be the consequence of his adamant opposition to the SALT II Treaty. I believe arms control, like our military forces, can contribute to our security and I will continue to pursue balanced, verifiable arms limitations agreements.

I believe progress is being made towards the world order I have described. Let me describe how I think my Administration's policies have fit into this broader vision:

America is at peace. For the first time in many years, my Administration has seen no engagement of American forces in combat. I am deeply proud of this fact. We all know the provocations have been many and the temptation to use force strong: we could have engaged in hostilities against Iran. But, I have chosen the course of patience and calmness. We attempted the rescue mission, and I believe this attempt was necessary. But, it was an attempt to free our fellow citizens; it was not a military action.

America is strong and growing stronger. My Administration has increased US real defense spending and successfully encouraged our NATO allies to do the same; we have launched the NATO Long-Term Defense Program, and we have agreed with our allies to deploy new missiles in Europe; we have developed the Rapid Deployment Force to

protect our vital interests wherever they may be threatened. Contrary to the irresponsible charges of the Republican Party, the United States has not become militarily inferior, "second to one" as Governor Reagan likes to quip. We are maintaining military equivalence with the Soviet Union. The long-term trends do show steady growth in Soviet military power, and we must continue our efforts over the long haul to preserve a stable balance. We will do so.

As a complement to our defense program, I have signed the SALT II Treaty to limit Soviet strategic forces while allowing the US to continue all its essential strategic modernization programs. The SALT Treaty, because it adds to American security, while contributing to nuclear stability, is one of the most important agreements of the decade. I am determined to seek its ratification.

American is providing leadership in a time of challenge.

I have met in five summits, and innumerable bilateral meetings with Western leaders to develop and coordinate policies to deal with the enormous economic and energy problems that confront the industrialized economies. The United States has played a leading role in stimulating and developing the North-South dialogue and in reaching agreement in the Multilateral Trade Negotiations. We have led the Western response to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. I have stated that the United States will use all means necessary, including the use of military force, to protect

our vital interests on the Persian Gulf. The West looks to the United States to provide leadership, and we are doing so.

America is broadening and deepening its relationships with the Third World. One of my proudest achievements is the normalization of relations with the People's Republic of China, while preserving a firm relationship with the people of Taiwan. Since normalization, the benefits of formal diplomatic relations with China have become clear. Trade, travel and, most of all, the security and stability of the Pacific region is greater now than at any time in this century. And, for the first time, the United States has good relations with both China and Japan.

We also contributed to and supported the settlement of the war in Rhodesia which led to the birth of the new nation of Zimbabwe. As a result of our strong support for majority rule in Africa, we are once again on good terms with that continent.

America is once again in the forefront in the pursuit of human rights. When I became President, I emphasized our commitment as a nation to human rights as a fundamental tenet of our foreign policy. We have sought to stand

behind basic principles of respect for the individual, for fair trials, for political liberty, and for economic and social justice. Our human rights policies have given new credibility and new force to U.S. policies in Africa, Latin America and Asia.

America is contributing to peace. America has given leadership in the peaceful resolution of regional tensions. I have mentioned our role in promoting the settlement in Zimbabwe. In addition, my Administration has contributed to peace in other ways.

-- In March 1979, Prime Minister Begin and President Sadat signed the Israel-Egypt peace treaty at the White House. Israel has finally gained peace with its largest Arab neighbor. A framework for a comprehensive peace has been established. Within the framework agreed to by Israel and Egypt, the United States is committed and determined, more than ever, to help them in their negotiations. I am determined to persevere in this long and arduous road, because I believe a just and stable peace for all the people of the Middle East lies at the end of it.

-- In Latin America, in the Panama Canal Treaties, we have recognized the deep feeling of the

Panamanian people, while retaining essential security rights to the United States. I believe those treaties have done more to strengthen U.S. influence in Latin America than any other step we could have taken. With the Panama Canal Treaties, together with our firm advocacy of human rights, we have forged a new, more enduring basis for our relations with our fellow Americans in the Southern Hemisphere.

My opponent seems to believe that the challenges facing us today are simple -- and so are the answers. I think Governor Reagan is looking backward to a simpler world where America was the only super-power, and global interdependence was a thing of the future.

The world is not like that now, if it ever was. The challenges are incredibly complex: think of developing and coordinating a global energy policy; think of forging workable relationships with the emerging nations of Africa and Asia; think of leading an Alliance of 15 proud, sovereign nations with diverse interests and foreign policies.

True leadership is not bulling one's way through these problems, compelling others to accept solutions made-in-America. That way leads to failure and animosity. I

believe leadership requires a willingness to tackle our problems head-on, but with an understanding of the need to compromise, to adjust to the possible, the attainable. And, yes, leadership requires the courage to recognize mistakes, and to change policies where necessary. That is the kind of leadership I have tried to give.

I believe deeply, honestly, that my vision of a better world is attainable. I have directed all my energies towards attaining that goal, and I will continue to do so.

September 29, 1980

Future Goals

Q. What are your top foreign policy and national security priorities for a second term?

How would these be different from Governor Reagan's?

Response

As with my first term, I will continue to address the difficult and controversial issues which confront our nation. In doing so I have no intention of looking for easy solutions or quick fixes. Rather, I will continue to seek solutions that are meaningful and lasting and in the long-term interests of the United States.

To this end, I see six basic priorities for the future:

- First, we will continue, as we have over the past four years, to build America's military strength and strong defense and economic relations with our allies and friends.
- Second, we will continue to demonstrate to the Soviet Union that a price will be paid for its refusal to abide by the accepted norms of international conduct. At the same time, we will make it clear to the Soviet Union that we seek no return to the Cold War, no indiscriminate confrontation. The choice is the Soviet Union's, we will respond to either.
- Third, we will remain deeply committed to the process of mutual and verifiable arms control and the effort to prevent the spread and further development of nuclear weapons. I intend.

to push for the ratification of the SALT II Treaty at the earliest opportunity. This agreement is in our national interests. We are more secure with it than without it.

- Fourth, we will pursue an active diplomacy in the world, working -- together with our friends and allies -- to resolve regional conflicts and to promote peace -- in the Middle East, and Persian Gulf, southern Africa, Central America, the Eastern Mediterranean.

- Fifth, we will strive to resolve pressing international economic problems -- particularly energy and inflation -- and continue to pursue our still larger objective of global economic growth through expanded trade and development assistance.

- Finally, and underlying all that we do, we will continue vigorously to support the process of building democratic institutions and improving human rights protection around the world.

The objectives I have outlined are in sharp contrast to those that could be pursued by Governor Reagan:

- Unlike my opponent, I do not believe a lasting world order is achievable by substituting the threat of intervention for diplomacy, by suggesting that we quarantine those nations which challenge our interests, or by seeking to regain an unachievable military superiority at an unimaginable cost.

- Unlike my opponent, I do not believe we are a weak and floundering nation, dismissed with contempt by our enemies,

abandoned by our allies and sinking into decline as a major power. Rather, I know our resolve is steady, our military is powerful, our alliances are strong and we are gaining new friends among the young nations of the world.

- Unlike my opponent, I do not believe we can return to an early day when American interests went unchallenged in the world arena. The world that exists today is a world of diversity, of unequal wealth, and uneven resources. It is a world of upheaval and unrest and will be for decades to come. But, as a powerful and self-confident nation, we can live with a good deal of turmoil in the world while we protect our interests and be a friend to those who seek a new life free from tyranny.

- Unlike my opponent, I would not return us to the days of the Cold War. I do not believe, as he does, that the Soviet Union is responsible for all the unrest in the world today. The world is much too diverse for such a simple explanation. But I will continue to insist, through our actions and our words, that the Soviet Union respect the legitimate interests of other nations.

- Unlike my opponent, I would not accuse our allies of neutralism or accommodation with the Soviet Union. Leading an alliance of proud sovereign nations requires tact, patience and understanding. We and our allies share profound political, security and economic interests, but we must never forget that ours is an association of free peoples, and the United States must lead, not dictate.

- Unlike my opponent, I would not abandon the arms control process, which has contributed to our nation's security and has taken so many years to construct. That would be the consequence of his rigid opposition to the SALT II Treaty.

- Unlike my opponent, I would not jeopardize our new relationship with the People's Republic of China by tampering with the form of our good relations with the people of Taiwan. Our new relationship with China is clearly in our national interest and contributes to the peace and security of the Pacific region.

- And, finally, unlike my opponent, I would not jettison human rights as a fundamental objective of U.S. foreign policy. I believe the true interests of our nation are best served by honoring the ideals of our heritage.

I do not believe the American people share Governor Reagan's view of the future, a world filled with fears of change and unrest and damaging self-doubts about our military capability and strength. My vision is different. It is based on reality, and filled with faith and an unbending determination to achieve a life of meaning and purpose for every American in a nation that is strong and secure. Above all, I want us to be what the founders of our nation meant us to become -- a symbol of freedom, peace and hope throughout the world.

Military Superiority vs. Essential Equivalence

Q: After accusing your Administration of permitting the Soviet Union to achieve military superiority, the Republican Platform states "We will build toward a sustained defense expenditure sufficient to close the gap with the Soviets, and ultimately reach the position of military superiority that the American people demand."

Would you comment on this Republican defense objective and contrast it with your own national security objectives?

Response

My Administration is dedicated to the maintenance of a military force that is second to none. Unlike Mr. Reagan, however, I do not advocate a policy of American military superiority over the Soviet Union.

The truth is that military superiority for either side is a military and economic impossibility -- if the other is determined to prevent it. There can be no return to the days of the American nuclear monopoly. There can be no winner in an all-out arms race. It is wishful thinking of the highest order to assume that the Soviets would drop out of a nuclear arms race early, or that they would shrink from imposing additional, even unimaginable hardships on their civilian society, in order to stay in the race.

As superficially attractive as the goal of across-the-board supremacy may be, common sense tells us that:

- It would mean the end of arms control. By definition, strategic superiority and arms control are incompatible -- a race to superiority is an attempt to achieve a real military advantage, one which the losing party would never accept in a formal arms control agreement. We will not negotiate from a position of inferiority, and neither will the Soviets.
- It would mean an uncontrolled, open-ended, and enormously expensive arms race. The sums involved would be huge even in absolute terms, let alone in the face of the Republican's proposed 30 percent tax cut.
- It would mean that we would have to skimp on conventional forces, where we need to improve, and to concentrate on a race in strategic weapons.
- It would channel the competition into the most dangerous arena -- the one most likely to lead to nuclear war, namely strategic arms.

Gov. Reagan's impulse for military superiority must be seen for what it is: unrealistic, simplistic, dangerous. In the real world, meeting our defense needs is not a matter of taking everything we have and increasing it by 10 percent or 20 percent or 40 percent. There is no magic formula. There is no quick fix.

My Administration will preserve our national security. We will improve our capabilities as necessary to maintain the military balance that exists today between the United States and the Soviet Union. We will continue to make steady and sustained increases in defense spending to build the capabilities we need. We will buy only the weapon systems that best serve our needs, not every glamorous weapon system that comes along. We will continue to seek equitable and verifiable arms control agreements -- like the SALT II Treaty -- to limit the growth in Soviet military power, and to avoid spending resources unnecessarily in an uncontrolled strategic arms race.

Prudence -- not impulse -- is the hallmark of a strong and a sane national security policy. Military power alone, no matter how great, cannot solve all of our international problems. Nor can it make the world over according to our design. I understand this reality;
Gov. Reagan does not.

Gov. Reagan on Military Superiority

In January, Reagan called for an immediate "military buildup aimed at restoring our military superiority." (Rutland-Herald, January 14, 1980) This same proposal was later incorporated in the Republican platform.

While he called for an immediate buildup aimed at military superiority, just four days earlier, Reagan outlined the dangers of his impending stand.

"What I have said is that our defenses must be whatever is necessary to ensure that the potential enemy will never dare attack you. Now, if that is equivalence or if that is superiority, you must have the degree to know that you are safe. I could see if you really strive for an obvious superiority then you may tempt the other side into being afraid and you continue escalating on both sides..."

Boston Globe
January 13, 1980

Reagan's most recent speeches follow both lines of reasoning -- calling for a military buildup to achieve nuclear superiority, and, once achieved, negotiate an arms limitation treaty.

"...I've called for whatever it takes to be strong enough that no other nation will dare violate the peace. Shouldn't it be obvious to even the staunchest believer in unilateral disarmament as the sure road to peace that peace was never more certain than in the years following World War II when we had a margin of safety in our military power which was so unmistakeable that others would not dare to challenge us?"

Veterans of Foreign Wars
August 18, 1980

Two days later he stated:

Since when has it been wrong for America to aim to be first in military strength? How is American military superiority "dangerous?"

American Legion
August 20, 1980